

Please add new claims 6-7 as follows:

- 6. A stencil printer comprising an ink supply pump in the form of a diaphragm pump in which the diaphragm is of a material whose swelling ratio to the ink is not larger than 1.05.--
- 7. A stencil printer comprising an ink supply pump for ultraviolet curing ink in the form of a diaphragm pump.--

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-3 have been amended, and new claims 6-7 have been added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank Examiners Crenshaw and Hilten for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Jason Vick, during the February 13 personal interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,051,777 to Black (hereinafter "Black"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*... an ink supply pump in the form of a diaphragm pump, wherein the diaphragm pump limits a stress applied to a diaphragm to less than 75% of the elastic limit of the diaphragm." Applicants respectfully submit that while Black discloses, on column 5, lines 6-10 that "this motor has a cam 142 mounted on his drive shaft, which cam engages with a cam follower 144 forming part of a liquid pump 146. This can be a simple diaphragm pump such a fuel pump from an internal combustion engine or the like." Black fails to teach limiting a stress applied to a diaphragm as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Black fails to teach, suggest or disclose the features recited in claims 2-3.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima*